

since 1905. I am pleased to honor the 100th anniversary of this unique building.

As early French pioneers made their way westward, they met the pristine beauty and abundant natural resources of the Mississippi River and its surrounding lands. Where the Mississippi meets the St. Croix River, they also encountered one of the most dense concentrations of native American villages in the upper Mississippi River Valley. It was here where many decided to settle, including those who began the first permanent settlement of Pierce County at Prescott in 1827.

By 1853, the population had grown and pierce became its own county, separating from St. Croix County. Prescott served as the first county seat, but in 1861 the people of the county voted to change the seat to Ellsworth. A brick courthouse then was constructed on the site of the current building.

The present courthouse was erected in 1905 in Ellsworth, and its evolution mirrors that of the city and of the county as a whole. The first courthouse in Ellsworth was made of logs. The next was a wooden frame building. Finally, in 1869, the brick courthouse was constructed, which included a jail. By the turn of the century, however, even this building was deemed inappropriate to the image and need of the growing county, and the current courthouse was erected as a true testament of the supremacy of law and a match to the beauty of the surrounding area.

Designed out of the neoclassical and Beaux arts architectural traditions, it is constructed from several types of native stone and accented by Tennessee marble. Inside, vaulted ceilings depict the beauty of western Wisconsin, rising to a baroque dome covering the five-story hexagonal rotunda. Mr. Speaker, this building truly brings well-deserved pride to the people of Pierce County.

On March 3, 1982, the Pierce County Courthouse was recognized by the National Register of Historic Places, honoring the courthouse as a historic place with great importance to the Pierce County community and the State of Wisconsin, as well as notable architectural significance. The residents of Pierce County also demonstrated their own appreciation for this unique courthouse when they chose to repair the beautiful building rather than allow the decapitation of its dome, a fate that often befalls historic buildings.

A centennial celebration will be held at the courthouse on June 26, 2005. I commend the people and the local public officials of Pierce County for having the vision to erect such a monument to justice, law, and beauty, and the foresight to maintain this local treasure. This building truly has been a source of pride to Pierce County for 100 years, and it will continue to do so for generations to come. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to honor this milestone before you today.

MELANIE SABELHAUS: A STRONG  
VOICE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 2005

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, today, I wish to recognize the outstanding dedication and leadership of Melanie Sabelhaus for her ef-

forts and accomplishments in supporting small business nationwide. Melanie became the Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration in April of 2002, and has since helped to lead the agency to greater efficiency and effectiveness while drawing attention to women-owned businesses. She is leaving her position this month to pursue opportunities in the private sector.

After 15 years at IBM, Melanie Sabelhaus learned firsthand some of the challenges that face entrepreneurs when she started a property rental and management company in 1986. Melanie's entrepreneurial drive and business savvy grew her small business into a \$10 million dollar a year enterprise. This woman is a success story.

When Melanie arrived at the SBA, she pledged to help create more opportunities for small business owners and entrepreneurs using her extensive business knowledge. She fulfilled her promise to an extent I could not have imagined. She, along with Administrator Hector Barreto and the rest of the agency, followed the President's Management agenda. SBA has made solid progress on most areas of the President's Management agenda.

Melanie was responsible for the successful implementation of the Execution Scorecard, which introduced ways to measure and rank district offices and SBA programs. The SBA also introduced the Business Matchmaking program while Melanie was in office, which has already resulted in 25,000 one-on-one meetings between small business owners and Federal agencies or large companies in the private sector.

As a woman entrepreneur herself, Melanie has given particular attention and support to women in small businesses. When she arrived at the agency in 2002, there were only 11,285 7(a) and 504 loans granted to women entrepreneurs for the entire year. In the past year, the number of loans to women has increased to over 18,000 for the two main loan programs at the agency. She is the leading advocate for women in business in this country, and has been a tremendous role model for women everywhere.

Melanie Sabelhaus has been the recipient of numerous philanthropy, business and government leadership awards, including 2002 Outstanding Volunteer Fundraiser of the Year Award for Maryland, awarded by the Association of Fundraising Professionals; the Artemis Award from the European-American Women's Conference; the Distinguished Women's Award from the Girl Scouts of Central Maryland; the Superstar Award from the Alzheimer's Association of Central Maryland; Maryland's Top 100 Women from The Daily Record; and the Outstanding Business Achievement Award from Ohio University.

I am sure that wherever Melanie Sabelhaus goes after her departure this month, she will make a similarly lasting mark there as she has at the SBA. Although I am sorry to see her go, my wife, Freda, and I wish her the best of luck in all of her future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 2005

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on four amendments to

H.R. 2863, Defense Appropriations for FY 2006, on Monday, June 20 due to a travel delay.

I would like the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted "aye" on agreeing to the Velázquez amendment; "aye" on agreeing to the DeFazio amendment; "aye" on agreeing to the Doggett amendment; and "aye" on agreeing to the Obey amendment.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.J. RES. 10, CONSTITUTIONAL  
AMENDMENT AUTHORIZING CONGRESS TO PROHIBIT  
PHYSICAL DESECRATION OF THE  
FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 2005

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 330 the Rule governing debate on H.J. Res. 10, an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit physical desecration of the flag of the United States. I oppose the Rule to H.J. Res. 10 because the Rule allows inadequate debate on a resolution is an overly broad infringement on the First Amendment Right to Freedom of Speech. This partisan, structure rule, severely limits amendment and debate on issues that affect every American citizen—the United States Constitution and the First Amendment.

I fully support the amendment offered by the Gentleman from North Carolina, the distinguished Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Mr. WATT. That amendment is so simple that it nearly restates the First Amendment to the Constitution—which further exemplifies the ridiculous nature of the underlying legislation we debate before the Committee of the Whole House. It is a shame that Members have to propose and offer amendments that require adherence to the U.S. Constitution—as Representatives of the United States of America, we are charged with the duty of upholding individual rights, not restrict them.

In last Congress' iteration of this very legislation, I proposed an amendment that was not made in order. My amendment to that bill was designed to protect Americans' right to express their opinions and views about government activity. My amendment stated in pertinent part, "a person shall not have violated a prohibition under that section for desecrating the flag, if such desecration is an expression of disagreement or displeasure with an act taken or decision made by a local, State, or Federal Government of the United States."

Under my amendment Americans would have retained their freedom to speak out against actions taken by local, State, and Federal Governments through desecrations of the flag symbolizing their views. Our democratic government is a government of the people. Our citizen's freedom of expression is at the very heart of our democracy. An attack on American's freedom of expression is an attack on our entire democracy. My amendment would have protected our democracy and protects our citizens.

This Rule, on the other hand, is potentially harmful to our democracy and America's citizens. Freedom of speech and freedom of expression are fundamental components of our

democracy. Limiting the ability of American citizens to voice their opinions about their government, through flag desecrations or otherwise, is a violation of the principles of our democracy that are symbolized in the American flag, including the First Amendment right to freedom of expression.

I hope that the Republican leadership sees the irony of their decision to draft such a restrictive rule. We are debating a resolution

that, if passed, will severely restrict American's ability to speak openly, freely, and fully, on issues that are of great concern to the public. Under this rule, my colleagues on this side of the aisle are restricted from speaking openly, freely, and fully, on an issue that will have a drastic impact on the public, the First Amendment.

This proposed amendment to the Constitution, H.J. Res. 10, is a severe abridgement of

the freedom of expression protected by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. This rule is a severe abridgement of our ability to debate an issue that may have a profound impact on one of America's most fundamental rights.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this Rule and I encourage my colleagues to do likewise.